

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The above Amendment and these Remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed October 31, 2008. Claims 1-33 were pending prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-33. This Response amends claims 1, 10, 13, 23, and 33; and adds new claim 35, leaving for the Examiner's consideration claims 1-33 and 35. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### **I. Claim Objections**

Claim 10 is objected to because of informalities. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim has been amended to conform to the Examiner's requirement. Accordingly, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) & 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 8-9, 13-17, 19, 23-27, 29, and 33 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0278585 to Spencer.

Claims 7, 10-12, 18, 20-22, 28 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,051,316 to Charisius.

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of "*wherein the at least one filter is used to extract data from and manipulate one or more contents of buffer used to transmit and receive streaming data.*"

Applicant respectfully submits that Spencer and other prior art do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 13, 23, and 33**

Claims 13, 23, and 33, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 1 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claim 35**

Claim 35 includes the feature of “*wherein the at least one filter allows a user to select which method in the tag library should be hit when stepping into the tag library from the JSP source code.*”

Applicant respectfully submits that Spencer and other prior art do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 2-12, 14-22, and 24-32**

Claims 2-12, 14-22, and 24-32 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

### **III. Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application are allowable, and Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 24, 2008

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/  
Kuiran (Ted) Liu  
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800